P R A C T I C A L A N T H R O P O L O G Y

Vol. 1 March 1954 No. 4

Editorial Committee

William A. Smalley Eugene A. Nida
Marie Fetzer Reyburn - James O. Buswell, III

Address all communications to:

Robert B. Taylor, Editor
410 E. Jefferson Street
Wheaton, Illinois

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/practical-anthropology_1954-03_1_4

PRACTICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Editorial Remarks

The favorable response to Practical Anthropology is very encouraging. It is clear that there is enough interest in the project to make it worth while. But we earnestly request your continued cooperation, for without it we can't continue.

One of our objectives is to serve as a way for Christians interested in anthropology to keep track of one another. To meet this objective it is imperative that you send us information about your own activities as well as those of others. We aren't looking for big news only. We want information about where people are and what they are doing, for others are interested. Frankly, very few of you have sent us information specifically for this purpose. We have gleaned most of the material for the news section from sources such as missionary prayer letters, various publications, and from a few of your personal letters. Too much of our information has come second hand, whereas it should come from you directly. Please include plenty of details, for others really are interested; we aren't just looking for space filler.

So far not one communication has come in response to our plea in the last issue for discussion and correspondence. If you have nothing to say, that's all right, but if you do have something to contribute, please share it with the rest of us. We will take the time to get material mimeographed and distributed if you will provide the material. We really need your support on this matter.

We are happy that a number of you have expressed an interest in contributing material to Practical Anthropology. It is apparent that there will be much good material available. We hadn't planned to burden you with an article by the editor this issue. The reason is

that we didn't ask anyone for an article soon enough, and those we had hoped might contribute for March felt that they needed more time. We hope a number of you have articles in preparation now. Then if we get behind on our correspondence again you'll be able to help us.

Some have asked what sort of material we are interested in for articles, so we have listed a few of the suggestions we have received. If you'd like to handle one of them, or are working on one, let us know.

1. How the Christian should separate himself from American culture. What are the proper standards of Christian behavior?
2. The implications of anthropology for teaching on the mission field.
3. How our Western cultural background causes us to misinterpret Scripture (which was written against the background of Palestinian culture) and what we can do about it.
4. A Christian evaluation of the anthropological doctrine of cultural relativism.
5. The amount of influence which one's native cultural background has on the behavior of one who is a "new creation in Christ." (One missionary writes of a trusted native assistant who slipped back into some of his old unchristian customs after several years of living a faithful Christian life.)
6. Accounts by missionaries of successes and failures in presenting the gospel to people of different cultural backgrounds. (We can use much of this, for it is not well covered in the missionary literature, in spite of its importance!)
7. Whether or not consciousness of sin is found in all cultures and what bearing this has on a missionary's approach, if any.
8. A Christian approach to fossil man.

There are, of course, many other possibilities.

ANTHROPOLOGY COURSES FOR MISSIONARIES

Robert B. Taylor

Anthropological training for missionaries is so important that those who believe in its value should take more vigorous steps to encourage missionary candidates to get it. This is not just idle speculation. A number of qualified observers have stressed the importance of preparation in the "missionary science." It should be apparent that those who are most qualified to express an opinion on the subject are those who have actually used the anthropological approach in field situations. But even missionaries not trained in anthropology have strongly recommended it for new missionaries. They realize from experience that the successful missionary must know not only the message of salvation, but also the people to which that message is to be given. Anthropological study is the most economical aid to the acquisition of this indispensable part of the missionary's equipment.

Too many of those who give lip service to the value of anthropological study hold an unfortunately limited appreciation of its importance. Too often they regard anthropology as something which will be helpful if the candidate can squeeze in a course or two somewhere along the line. It is not regarded as a vitally important part of his program of preparation. Obviously many good missionaries have never had such training, but no missionary can be really successful unless he knows his people and their culture. The quickest way to get that knowledge is to become acquainted with the principles of cultural behavior and the specific forms and functions of the culture of the people the missionary plans to work with.

The approach of an anthropologically oriented missionary differs significantly from that of one who is not. Unless he is an especially discerning person, the missionary without the anthropological point of view

flounders unnecessarily for years, and some never become oriented to working in a foreign cultural situation. A missionary in Peru has written us of the very different approach to tribal work by those who have anthropological training. Another missionary, a real enthusiast on missionary anthropology before he went to the field, writes that he is more convinced than ever of the value of anthropological training for missionaries. Still another missionary declares that one can't possibly appreciate how important anthropological training is until he has had the opportunity to use it. Even those who have had only a few courses in anthropology report that they have been helped and express a desire to obtain further training.

Yet most Christian missionaries and others connected with the missionary endeavor seem to be unaware of the importance of anthropological training. Some openly oppose it. And it is apparent that most of those who give lip service to it do not believe in its importance deeply enough to make much of an effort to stimulate interest in anthropology and encourage prospective missionaries to get anthropological training.

The value of anthropological training has been and is being proven on the field, so let's encourage people to get it. We are not serving and honoring our Lord by failing to direct missionary candidates to training which will result in many more souls being brought into the body of Christ. That, it seems to me, is the issue at stake.

It would be well for missionaries to have at least an undergraduate major in anthropology or its near equivalent. Obviously, few will acquire such training in the near future. The next best thing that we can do is to encourage missionaries to secure as much good anthropological preparation as they can from nearby colleges and universities while they are attending seminary, Bible school, etc. We should like to see a series of notes published in Practical Anthropology

evaluating the programs offered in a number of colleges and universities.

It is best, of course, to have a general course in anthropology before proceeding with more advanced work. In fact, introductory courses may be prerequisite to permission for further work. There may be a choice between a general anthropology course and an introductory cultural anthropology course. For the missionary the culture course will probably be more valuable, for general anthropology courses are sometimes overloaded with material on physical anthropology. Material on human evolution is hardly relevant to the missionary's task, and a large part of some general anthropology courses are devoted to this. The physical material on race is of value, but the anthropological point of view on race probably can be acquired in other courses. From an introductory course one should expect to acquire a basic knowledge of the nature and content of culture and its implications for understanding the many varieties of human behavior found around the world.

It is extremely important that the missionary acquire the everyday language of the people as rapidly and well as possible. The best way to do this is through the study of linguistics. While more specialized training may be required for Bible translation, a knowledge of basic linguistic principles and techniques is virtually indispensable as an aid to satisfactory language learning. Descriptive linguistics, i. e. phonetics, phonemics, morphology, syntax, should be emphasized rather than comparative linguistics or theoretical studies, for they bear more directly on language learning. Good programs in descriptive linguistics are sometimes available in some of our colleges and universities, usually as a part of the anthropology program. In some institutions, however, the courses are poorly oriented to the needs of the missionary, hence it may be best to take linguistic training at the Summer Institute of Linguistics or some Christian school which has a good program in linguistics.

It seems that many missionaries have an inadequate understanding of the religions which they are, in effect, asking people to abandon in favor of Christianity. There is a tendency to bunch all primitive religious beliefs and practices under the catch-all heading of animism, with consequent failure to appreciate the great diversity of forms and functions. The values and meanings of primitive religions for the people who observe them is generally not appreciated. Courses in primitive religion are a very important part of the missionary's anthropological preparation and are generally more satisfactory than those not taught from an anthropological point of view.

Too frequently the missionary supposes that the language and the religion of the people are the only aspects of their culture he needs to understand. It will also be found profitable to take courses in primitive society, for the elements of social organization are intimately tied in with the religion. Strong functional linkages between religion and the social patterns may cause people to reject Christianity and make it difficult for Christians to grow in their faith. Marriage customs, polygyny, kinship terminology and behavior, secret societies, etc., must be understood as thoroughly as possible by the missionary.

Every missionary or candidate should take an area ethnography course on the cultures of the people in the area where he works. These courses are available in any good department of anthropology for different parts of the world, e.g., Cultures of Southeast Asia, Peoples of the Andes, etc. Even the returned missionary can profit from such studies, for it is too often true that the missionary lives among his people for many years, or even a lifetime, without ever really knowing them.

Many of those who are aware of the necessity of understanding the specific customs of the people fail to appreciate the importance of general principles of cultural behavior. Extremely important in this day of

extensive cultural change is the study of cultural dynamics. We need to become more aware that the missionary is always an agent of cultural change, whether he wants to be or not. It is deeply important that he be aware of the significant implications of cultural change for his work, hence, cultural dynamics courses should not be overlooked.

In selecting a cultural dynamics course one should be careful not to get involved in one which overemphasizes the study of diffusion and reconstruction of cultural history. That aspect of cultural dynamics which bears on the missionary effort is acculturation, the processes of change resulting from contact of different cultures. It is unlikely that the missionary will find himself working with any culture which has not undergone some degree of acculturation. This is bound to affect his work.

Dr. Horner's article in the January issue of Practical Anthropology called our attention to the importance of understanding individual personalities against the background of their culture. If the missionary is to comprehend the personal and spiritual problems of his people, present the gospel to them effectively or help them in spiritual growth, he should be aware of how the culture has moulded the individual and how the individuals respond to their cultures. For this reason, Culture and Personality courses will prove to be of inestimable value to the missionary.

A number of anthropology departments offer work in Applied Anthropology. Most of them have to do with the administration of native peoples, but they will prove very helpful for the missionary, for many of his problems are basically the same. Much food for thought will be found for the missionary when one of these courses is taught by an anthropologist who has worked among peoples who have had contact with missionaries.

In the November issue of Practical Anthropology Mrs.

Reyburn illustrated out of her own experience how many important things the missionary can learn by employing anthropological field techniques. While the missionary can't devote all his time to field studies, he should, nevertheless, make the study of the culture a life-long project. There is always more to learn, and the missionary who knows how to observe, what to watch for, how to use informants, and how to record and interpret the data will profit immeasurably. Ethnological field methods courses, then, should be taken, too.

It is extremely difficult to say which courses are more important than others. Any selection of courses obviously will be based on various personal considerations. Without implying anything as to the relative importance of the courses mentioned previously we'd like to suggest that the courses which should be taken first are: 1) Introductory Anthropology (General or cultural), 2) Linguistics (Even if it is no more than a phonetics course), 3) Area Ethnography, and 4) Primitive Religion. It should be understood that this is a tentative suggestion. In deciding on which courses to take one should seek the advice of one who is qualified by virtue of his anthropological training and awareness of the problems of the missionary.

It may appear that it is overloading the missionary trainee to ask him to add anthropology courses to his already full training program. We must simply ask whether or not it is worth it in terms of souls brought to Christ and the development of strong indigenous Christian churches. Anthropologically trained and oriented missionaries are saying that it is. Can we rightly neglect to encourage missionaries and missionary candidates to secure this preparation?

Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

BOOK REVIEWS

Creation and Evolution, Monograph Two, 3rd ed., September, 1953, American Scientific Affiliation, Goshen, Indiana.[1]

Far too much anti-evolutionary literature has been characterized by a lack of objectivity. The efforts of many authors have been abortive insofar as they reveal an uninstructed enthusiasm, or the dogmatism and denial of facts which so often accompanies a limited knowledge of them.

Happily, the paper under review is a scholarly departure from that style. It is a careful and dispassionate examination of the facts bearing on several aspects of the oft-conflicting ideas regarding evolution and creation. It is not an attempt directly to disprove evolution, or to prove that the Bible is true, but, taking the claims of evolution as a starting point, "It is the intent of this discussion to determine how far this process has proceeded." (P. 2)

Dr. Mixter shows himself to be well qualified as a zoologist to speak on these matters, showing a particular familiarity with genetics and ornithology from which fields much factual and illustrative material has been drawn. His acquaintance with authoritative writers who have been widely acclaimed for their contributions to evolutionary thought is also revealed by frequent references to such men as A. F. Shull and Th. Dobzhansky in genetics, A. S. Romer and G. G. Simpson in paleontology, and E. Mayr in systematics, or the classification of living things. To those of us who know Dr. Mixter,[2] his testimony to the saving knowledge of Christ is unquestioned. He is a believer in the historic fundamentals of the Faith, and in no sense can he be thought of as a "liberal" or as showing any "theistic evolutionary" tendencies. Such a position, it is understood, is a veritable intellectual no-man's-land, respected neither by scientists nor Bible-believing Christians.

I mention these things by way of a more detailed attempt to acquaint the reader with the author whose conclusions regarding creation and evolution we are about to review.

Creation and Evolution is divided into six major divisions. First there is an introductory statement in which the author makes it clear that it is the Christians duty to study the facts of God's creation. Citing Brewster's remark that "... God 'created' has always meant 'I don't know'," [3] he adds that "the 'I don't know' of the Creationist is likely to soothe him into complacency so that he does not search the natural sciences for explanations of 'things as they are.' Perhaps the phrase 'God made it that way' is an excuse for lack of research." (P. 2)

With this pertinent warning, the author also makes one other very important point in the introductory remarks. That is that the use of the term "evolution" to mean "any change at all of any amount, no matter how small" is not the full nor correct usage of the term.

> If the Savannah Sparrow of the mainland gives rise to the Ipswich Sparrow, living on Sable Island, 100 miles off the coast of North America, evolution has occurred. But this is a very restricted use of the term. In this sense, Creationists are evolutionists ...So believing that the descendants of Adam and Eve are now members of different races is believing in evolution in this restricted sense.

Some evolutionists over-simplify their claims to the extent of defining evolution as "descent with modification" and no more.[4] However, the hypothesis of evolution implies infinitely more than this merely genetically demonstrable aspect.

In concluding the introductory statement of his position Dr. Mixter reminds us that

> It should not be concluded that because one accepts transitions of some kinds into others that he

necessarily accepts all the evolutionary changes that have been postualted." (P. 2)

There are those who believe that the mere admission of any process at all in God's creation is a denial of God's Word and a capitulation to the evolutionary position. Nevertheless, if the acts of natural science conflict with such opinions, it behooves us to examine these opinions, whether they be of Biblical origin, or merely a traditional interpretation of Scripture, which could be changed to fit the facts, without destroying a particle of Scriptural truth.

The remaining five sections of Creation and Evolution present a factual discussion of certain problems of Variety in Nature, The Meaning of Similarities Between the Species, Animal Distribution, Paleontology, and Genetics.

In the first of these, the author considers the much debated question of the correlation of the term "kind" used in Genesis 1, with the taxonomic system as we know it today. Obviously "one should not insist that 'kind' means species" (P. 3), since that is a man-made, arbitrary category in the first place. Mixter goes on to state that

> Instead of equating "kind" with any category of classification, it is wise to study living fossil plants and animals to discover what variety is possible by descent from an original type (e. g. the races of mankind from the first pair) and what types cannot be related by descent but would require distinct creations. (P. 3)

After detailed consideration of fossil evidence, the horse too, appears to fall into a situation similar to that of man. For, as Dr. Mixter states later in the paper, "the modern horse appears to have ascended from Eohippus by gradual changes no greater than those accounting for genetic differences within a species." (P. 22). Evolved? Perhaps--but only in the sense of

descent with modification previously referred to; not out of any other kind of animal.

The author agrees with Douglas Dewar that "the units of creation"... may not exactly coincide with any of the present systematic categories." (P. 5). This I believe, is a very reasonable assumption. There seems to be a very strong likelihood that the creative units, that is, the ancestral basic types of the present multitude of various animal and plant forms were not of a nature comparable to the present species, genus, or even family. Dr. Mixter asks,

> Where shall we draw the boundaries of the groups descending from created animals? Draw it where the paleontologists indicate there are gaps between orders in practically all cases, also between man and the apes. (P. 17)

From his discussion of fossils in a later section it is easily shown that this is a very possible and advisable thing to do.

Dr. Mixter then outlines the different reasons for the essential error in one of evolutions's primary assumptions, namely, that similarity implies genetic relationship. He arrives at the very cautious conclusion that "some similarities between different species may not be the result of their kinship," (P. 9), which of course is shown to undermine the conclusions reached by the evolutionists, who, "concluding that one order arose from another... place their reliance on the principle...that similarity of one group to another suggests its source in that group." (P. 10

The author's discussion of embryonic resemblances is a far cry from the common denial of the classic statement that "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny." After explaining the developmental particulars regarding the famous "gill slit" region of the vertebrate embryo, he wastes no words denying a fish state in man's ancestry as such. Instead, he contributes a positive statement which is at once eminently sane and objective:

> A study of the derivatives of the gill arches will convince one that practically all of the material which becomes gills in a fish is used for the construction of certain of the structures of the throat region in man. A common plan is followed in all vertebrates and modified for the needs of the developing individual and the fully formed organism. This common plan may be attributed to descent from an ancient vertebrate or to a Creator who uses the same fundamental process for all vertebrates but varies it at will for specific purposes.... Each class of vertebrate, whether fish, amphibian, reptile, bird, or mammal, has an efficient circulation. Creative activity is not bound to make an entirely different arrangement of blood vessels for each class. (P. 11)

It is the reviewer's opinion that this type of presentation is much more effective than a mere denial of a "so-called fish stage" for man. It leaves the burden of proof of relationship with the evolutionist who is at the same time informed of a positive Creationist point of view, rather than a negative anti-evolutionary reaction.

A valuable discussion of vestigial organs is characterized by the same fairness and objectivity.

In the section on "The Distribution of Animals" Mixter deals with the question of the universality of the flood. There will be Christians whose reaction will be one of abhorrence at the mere thought of questioning the Biblical account. Yet when one realizes that an examination of the facts in nature most emphatically does not imply a questioning of Scripture, but only a re-examining of traditional interpretations, it will be seen that the position held here is one of honest inquiry and seeking the truth. In no case does it involve compromising any doctrinal stand, nor does it imply any inconsistency in the inspired Word.

Basing his investigations mainly upon the analysis of recent and prehistoric animal distributions, Mixter cites different types of animals which have never been found outside of Australia, or the American continents. He makes plain that even though many animals have had a wider distribution than they have now, there are many types which are not able to be traced back to the region of Mt. Ararat. He concludes:

> To me, this indicates that they never were in the ark. Two alternatives remain: either these animals developed after the flood, or they were living in countries not affected by the flood. Because the edentates were in existence long before the Pleistocene, (the flood was a judgment upon mankind so that it can be assumed to have been during the late Pleistocene), we are convinced that they did not originate after the flood. Therefore they were not in the region covered by the waters. This leads to the conclusion that the flood was not world wide. (P. 15)

These facts would seem to throw into relief certain aspects of the flood question seldom considered by Christian writers.

Of greatest interest to the reviewer is the consideration of paleontological data called "Fossils Suggest Creation." It is from this material primarily that the category of "order" presents itself as the most logical parallel to "kind" in Genesis as far as present knowledge is concerned. It is also from this material that we gain an accurate picture of the "evolution" of the horse mentioned above, and, most significant, of its limitations.

Other important matters which strike our attention in this section are the discussions of the sudden appearance in the geological record of varieties of complex forms; the significant structural gaps between these and postulated ancestral ones mentioned above; and the implications for Christians in the matter of the acceptance of geological ages of extreme antiquity.

This last point provokes a stimulating discussion

regarding the creative "days" of Genesis 1 being interpreted as long periods of time, which, all things considered seems to the reviewer to be the most logical position regarding this question. The most widely held alternative theory of the catastrophic hiatus between verses 1 and 2 of the first chapter of Genesis, and other variations of the Pember theory seem invariably to include some incompatible ideas, e. g. a pre-Adamic position assigned to all fossil men, conflicting with the Biblical presentation of Adam as the first man. The authenticity of fossil human remains is generally questioned by adherents to this position, but is frequently accompanied by a review of certain ones whose brain capacity and general morphology are known to indicate a truly human status, such as the Cro-Magnon specimens. The contradiction of a pre-Adamic position for these men is immediately apparent.

Dr. Mixter establishes his position then, with those who accept the facts of paleontology, yet without any damaging implications of evolutionary interpretations.

> This study accepts the conclusions of geologists regarding the arrangement of the strata and the estimated age of them... A belief in the findings of geologists regarding the strata does not automatically make a person an evolutionist.... A belief in an earth millions of years old and in successive creations separated by long time gaps is in harmony with the viewpoint of a number of theologians. (P. 19)

The fifth and last section, "The Science of Heredity and the Source of Species" deals primarily with data drawn from various groups of birds as well as the genetic experimentation with the well known fruitfly genus, Drosophila, to illustrate a consideration of the question, "To what extent have species changed into other species?"

We find that "crosses can be made between species and between genera, and only infrequently between

members of different families and orders." This will surprise many readers whose familiarity with the anti-evolutionary argument that there is no transmutation of species has prejudiced him against any consideration of a re-definition of these systematic relationships. Dr. Mixter explains that:

> As a creationist, one may accept the origin of species from other species, called microevolution, but need not believe that a protozoon was transformed into a coelenterate, or a coelenterate into a round or segmented worm (nor) hold that similar macro-evolutionary transformations have occurred leading to man. (Pp. 26-27)

The value of Creation and Evolution for interested students in the physical sciences and to those teachers in Christian schools who have had particular difficulty meeting the queries of supposedly unanswerable "evolutionary facts cannot be overestimated.

This kind of non-evolutionary contribution as well as the whole effort and purpose of the American Scientific Affiliation makes it no longer possible for the scientific world to believe that "Creationism is only held now in non-scientific or anti-scientific circles."

Anti-evolutionary authors who have relied largely upon belligerent sarcasm and negativistic debunking instead of an examination and alternate interpretation of facts are those who have given Creationism this reputation. At the same time they are likely unwittingly to lead to the downfall of young Christians whose faith ebbs away as the realization dawns that those who claimed to show the impossible position of the evolutionary hypothesis didn't know what they were talking about.

That is not to say, however, that the evolutionary position is any the more tenable for these failures to disprove it. Based as it is upon mechanistic and hypothetical assumptions, it is completely inadequate as far

as an explanation of the development and growth of living things is concerned.

In reviewing this booklet, the temptation has been great to let more and more passages speak for themselves. As one reviewer has said, "Man shall not review by quotation alone!" Nevertheless, for the sake of a wider circulation of these ideas, and of the commendable method with which they have been presented, quoting significant passages has not been restricted.

In conclusion let it be emphasized that the Creationist never need fear accepting all of the facts of genetics, paleontology, and biology. For though they are used for evolutionary ends, they will never show an atom of evolutionary proof, nor will they contradict an atom of Biblical truth, for they are the creation of the Author of the Book.

James O. Buswell, III

Shelton College
Ringwood, N. J.

(Reprinted from The Bible Today, November 1950, by permission of the author).

NOTES

1. Obtainable from the Secretary-Treasurer, The American Scientific Affiliation, 107 W. Plymouth Ave., Goshen, Indiana. Single copies, Fifty cents; lots of 10 or more, thirty cents each.

2. Professor of Zoology, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.

3. Creation, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1927, p. 83.

4. Howells, W. W., Mankind So Far, Doubleday, Garden City, N. Y., 1947, p. 5.

5. G. G. Simpson, in a lecture in Philadelphia, April 20, 1950.

NOTES - NEWS - PEOPLE - PROJECTS

Wesley Thiesen in Peru

Mr. Wesley Thiesen is working with the Wycliffe Bible Translators in Peru. He reports that he has been able to collect a considerable amount of ethnological material on the Bora Indians during the two years he has been working among them.

Mr. and Mrs. Blight Working in Mexico

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Blight are engaged in missionary work among the Eastern Otomi Indians in the state of Hidalgo in Mexico.

New Tribes Reached by VietNam Mission

Gordon H. Smith of the Christian and Missionary Alliance reports the opening of work among the Mnong Bunor tribe 100 miles west of Banmethuot, Viet Nam, Indo-China. The mission is in the process of expanding westward with a chain of mission stations reaching 200 miles to the Stieng tribe at Nui Bara. The expanded program is made possible by the enlargement of a force of native workers trained in the Bible School at Banmethuot. There are now 65 of these workers.

Stieng People at
Nui Bara, South Viet Nam

Smith is author of The Missionary and Anthropology and The Missionary and Primitive Man.

Engstrom Nears Completion of Alaskan Tour

Chaplain Leonard Engstrom writes of occasional contacts with remote communities in Alaska which are of considerable interest from an anthropological point of view. He reports that he always has found his anthropological training of great value. Engstrom expects to return to the States and a new assignment within a few months.

Delano Plans Anthropology Work

Mr. and Mrs. Bob Delano are engaged in missionary effort among the Naga peoples of Assam, India. They are planning to return to the United States for furlough in May, 1954, and testify that it is a matter of regret to them that due to the tense situation now developing in India they may not be able to return to Assam. Mr. Delano expects to pursue graduate work at the Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford Seminary, specializing in the Anthropology of Southeast Asia.

Blaschke Engaged in Language Study

Rev. Bob Blaschke is in Paris, France studying the French language preparatory to missionary work in French West Africa under Sudan Interior Mission.

Northrop Resumes Anthropology Studies

After eight years of absence from anthropological study, Rev. Gordon Northrop, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Farmington, Mich., is taking part-time graduate work in anthropology at the University of Michigan. He has also done graduate work at the University of Pennsylvania.

Rev. Northrop recently spent two weeks on the Island of Haiti taking missionary pictures, Interesting problems in acculturation are available for study in this area where Negroes from many parts of Africa mingle with the French, the English and the almost extinct American Indians.

Reyburns Doing Research in Argentina

Bill and Marie Fetzer Reyburn of Riobamba, Ecuador are beginning a period of anthropological and linguistic field work in Argentina. The Reyburns have been asked to spend five or six months making a survey among the Toba Indians of northern Argentina similar to the one they did for the Llano Grande mission near Quito. Mrs. Reyburn reported of the Quechua survey in the November issue of Practical Anthropology.

Westberg Observes Japanese Sub-cultures

Mr. Harry Westberg, working as a missionary in Japan writes of the striking differences between the highly westernized Japanese of the urban areas and those in the vast rural areas. For example, he points out that the rural Japanese make many things from the ever plentiful rice straw--footwear, headgear, toys, etc.

Creer Reports Japanese Customs

Mr. Raymond D. Creer writes of his great interest in the culture of Japan. He reports that lack of sufficient understanding of the culture has been one of the chief hindrances to successful missionary work in Japan. Mr. Creer has observed that the celebration of the Shinto New Years ceremonies poses serious problems for Japanese Christians, for not to partake of the ceremony is considered a major sin.

MILTON GABLER

Wycliffe Bible Translators have suffered a severe loss in the death of Milton Gabler, who went to be with the Lord on March 16, 1954. He had been ill for some years with a heart ailment. Milt was a graduate of Wheaton College, and began work with the Wycliffe group as a translator in Mexico. His ailment forced his retirement from this endeavor, and he spent a number of years in the Wycliffe office in Glendale, California, assisting each summer in the program of the Summer Institute of Linguistics at Norman, Oklahoma. For the

past several years he has been at Sulphur Springs, Ark. overseeing the development of the Wycliffe Home there, and continuing his work for the Summer Institute.

Our sympathy is extended to his wife, Grace (McNaughton), and the three boys, Tim, Dan and Stevie.

--R. C. Stone

PARTIAL LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS

Robert Spreckels
106 Gibson St.
West Liberty, Iowa

Lynn Stairs
Gordon College
30 Evans Way
Boston 15, Mass.

Harry Stam
3941 Aldrich Ave. So.
Minneapolis, 9, Minn.

Jon. Stam
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Claude E. Stipe
1758 Bryn Mawr Ave.
Santa Monica, Calif.

Robert Stone
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Del Suggs
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Summer Institute of
Linguistics
Box 870
Glendale 5, Calif.

Marilyn Taylor
Westmont College
55 La Paz Road
Santa Barbara, Calif.

R. B. Taylor
Adams, Oregon

Wesley Thiesen
Casilla 2492
Lima, Peru

Parker A. Thompson
7822-12 Avenue
Brooklyn 28, N. Y.

Dick Turner
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Ill.

Arnold Tweten
1222 N. Campbell Ave.
Chicago 22, Ill.

Mary Ellen Walker
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Ill.

Robert Wanstall
604 W. Hartwell Lane
Philadelphia 18, Pa.

Viola Waterhouse
Heroes 53
Mexico 3, D. F.

Library
Westminster Theological
Seminary
Chestnut Hill
Philadelphia 18, Pa.

Wheaton College Library
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

William E. Welmers
D.M.L., Morrill Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

Harry Westberg
Gakko Cho, 3 Chome
Nagaoka, Niigata Ken
Japan

Kenneth L. Wilkins
831 Grevelia
So. Pasadena, Calif.

Donald R. Wilson
Faith Theological Seminary
Elkins Park
Philadelphia 17, Pa.

David Winter
533 Hermosa St.
South Pasadena, Calif.

William A. Wonderly
Mt. Lake Park, Maryland

Nancy Wood
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Clifford Bedell
140 Syosset-Woodbury Rd.
Syosset, N. Y.

Robert C. Blaschke
c/o Mme. Jourdain
1 Place St. Sulpice
Paris 6, France

Raymond D. Creer
49 Aza Sawada
Tsukurimichi
Aomori City
Japan

Ronald Frase
Box 233-M
Pasadena, Calif.

(List to be continued in May issue)